

EVENT TYPE	OBJECTIVE(s)	MRP COMMENT ITEM	OPTION CHOICES	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES	AGREEMENT STATUS*
STORM EVENT						
	To determine impact of irrigated agriculture resulting from storm events	Trigger for Monitoring	monitor two storm events	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	does not necessarily address storms that will have the greatest impact	
			first storm after dormant spray	more likely to capture orchard crop pesticides	there may be no storm events after dormant spraying	
					Difficult to identify when this occurs for all sites	
			first storm event after other agriculture practices occur (eg: field tilling, row-crop pre-emergent, etc.)	more likely to capture pesticides or increases in sedimentation caused by tillage	Difficult to identify when this occurs for all sites	
					there may be no storm events after dormant spraying	
			first flush	more likely to capture higher concentrations of toxicant residuals	difficult to identify for all sites	
					will be difficult to relate to any Ag management practices	
			based on 'x' inches of rainfall at site	weather stations can be monitored on-line at the office	will miss first flush events	
					will be difficult to relate to any Ag management practices	
			Eliminate seasonal variable and monitoring based on storm events by developing a year-round strategy with a pre-determined monitoring schedule. (eg: monthly monitoring for specific water quality variables, nutrients, solids and a less-frequent approach [6-8 weeks?] for metals, pesticides, and toxicity.	Provides more consistency of data accumulation across coalitions, which will facilitate a more effective program evaluation.	With a pre-determined schedule, the chances of characterizing the impact of a storm event on water quality in irrigated agriculture is minimized.	
				The predetermined schedule for monitoring is easier formula for coalitions, laboratories and consultants to follow		
				The predetermined schedule for monitoring is easier to track, evaluate and assess for Water Board staff.		

				Eliminates the potential for having no data, when a pre-determined trigger for sufficient storm event monitoring proves invalid.		
				Eliminates the failure to predict sufficient runoff events based on rainfall total or other criteria.		
				There is a precedent for utilizing a pre-determined monitoring design.		
			Coalitions Develop a plan that addresses the objectives and options listed above.	Allows for site-specific considerations in monitoring rationale	Requires pre-planning for each site prior to monitoring season	yes
			Photo-monitoring at storm events, esp. when samples not collected	validates the hydrology of the particular monitoring site		yes
				Serves as evidence when report indicates there is insufficient flow to collect samples		
	source identification	Follow-up to Toxicity	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites. No scientific rationale for two sites	
					Does not have a 'stop point' for repeat monitoring	
					Is not meaningful for toxicity that is caused by known sources.	
					Does not allow for the storm-event temporal inconsistency	
	Frequency (duration), magnitude, persistence		Resample at same site	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Will not reflect same storm event	
				Addresses duration, (persistence) of toxicity	May not be raining anymore	
					Does not allow for the storm-event temporal inconsistency	
	source identification		Communicate with landowners and Ag Commissioners	can provide information about pesticide use	Does not address other forms of toxicity (eg: metals from sedimentation)	yes
	source identification, frequency, persistence		Based on 1st year results, monitor sequentially during next years' storm events		Pesticide applications may not be consistently applied from year to year	
					No possibility of acquiring duration/persistence information	
					Storm events relative to pesticide applications may not be consistent from year to year	

					Does not allow for the storm-event temporal inconsistency	
					<i>Does not account for variations from year to year in pesticide use, ag practice differences, weather, other changes</i>	
	Frequency (hint at duration)		Based on 1st storm event results, monitor sequentially during next storm event	Can provide duration (persistence) information	Pesticide residue may be washed away after first storm event	
					Does not allow for the storm-event temporal inconsistency	
			Coalitions Develop a plan that addresses the objectives and options listed above.	Allows for site-specific considerations in monitoring rationale	Requires pre-planning for each site prior to monitoring season	yes
	source identification	Field Data Exceedances (eg: pH, EC, DO, temp...)	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites. No scientific rationale for two sites	
					Does not have a 'stop point' for repeat monitoring	
	source identification		Evaluate Source Water (eg: river or irrigation canal supply water prior to passing through coalitin boundaries)	Will indicate any pre-existing water quality problems prior to entering coalition boundaries	more testing/more cost	
					Difficulties in drawing conclusions based on limited number of samples	
				<i>provides information with respect to Anti-degradation policy, and pre-existence of impairments prior to entering coalition boundaries</i>		
	frequency, duration, magnitude		Resample at same site	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Will not reflect same storm event	
				Addresses persistence of the problem	May not be raining anymore	
	source identification		Move upstream to identify source on the same day	greater possibility of identifying source if done on same day - possible for field monitoring	extends time that monitoring crew will need to be out - greater expense	
					Does not allow for temporal scale of information	
			Develop a plan combination of the above options	Allows for site-specific considerations in monitoring rationale	Requires pre-planning for each site prior to monitoring season	yes

	source identification	Bacteriological Contaminants	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites	
					Does not have a 'stop point' for repeat monitoring	
					Does not allow flexibility where source is already known, or BMPs are already being implemented, etc.	
			Coalitions Develop a plan that addresses the objectives and options listed above.	<i>Allows for site-specific considerations in monitoring rationale</i>	<i>Requires pre-planning for each site prior to monitoring season</i>	yes
	source identification	Chemistry Data Exceedances	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites. No scientific rationale for two sites	
					Does not have a 'stop point' for repeat monitoring	
					Some results take several weeks for laboratory to produce	
	frequency (duration), magnitude and persistence		Resample at same site	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Will not reflect same storm event	
				Addresses persistence of the problem	May not be raining anymore	
	source identification		Use historical record for determining resample strategy	Allows for site-specific considerations in monitoring rationale	Requires pre-planning for each site prior to monitoring season	
	source identification		Resample at same time as toxicity tests are resampled, if toxicity tests implicate a pesticide group or metals, etc.	would provide more timely information related to toxicity results	more testing, more cost	
			<i>Coalitions Develop a plan that addresses the objectives and options listed above.</i>	<i>Allows for site-specific considerations in monitoring rationale</i>	<i>Requires pre-planning for each site prior to monitoring season</i>	yes